

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

## **IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,957	08/09/2001	Lise Wiseman	12587-008001	5383
26212	7590	07/29/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 225 FRANKLIN STREET BOSTON, MA 02110			BROSS, EDWARD J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2126	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,957

Applicant(s)

WISEMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Edward Bross

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/9/01 2/20/02 3/4/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-48 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10-17, 18, 19, 22-24, 27, 38-40, 43-45 and 48 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al. (5,913,061).

3. As to claim 1, Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a method of exchanging information among applications, the method comprising:

providing a plurality of transformers (30 Fig. 1), each transformer corresponding to a unique transformation from one format into another (col. 4 lines 7-32);

using a first transformer to transform a data object from a format understandable by a first application into a common format data object (105 Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 22-24);

publishing the common format data object to a communication channel (105 Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 24-25);

subscribing to the communication channel to retrieve the published common format data object (102 Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 25-30); and

using a second transformer to transform the common format data object into a format understandable by a second application (110 Fig. 2 and col. 5 lines 34-39).

Art Unit: 2126

4. As to claim 2, Gupta discloses the data object corresponds to one or more of a plurality of business events (col. 5 lines 10-17).

5. As to claim 5, Gupta discloses using a first transformer to transform the data object from the format understandable by the first application into the common format data object is performed in response to a recognition of a business event by the first application (col. 5, lines 10-17).

6. As to claim 6, Gupta discloses that the method is performed in accordance with a plurality of process models that collectively define when information is to be exchanged among applications (rules engine col. 7, lines 46-58).

7. As to claim 7, Gupta discloses publishing the common data format object to a communications channel is performed by a source connector and subscribing to the communication channel is performed by a target connector (first application is the source and the second application is the target col. 5 lines 31-39).

8. As to claim 10, Gupta discloses information is exchanged among business support systems or operational support systems or a combination thereof (col. 4 lines 61-65).

Art Unit: 2126

9. As to claim 11, Gupta discloses at least one of the transformers comprises a class defined in an object-oriented programming language (implied by “object-oriented interface” col. 4 lines 9-10).

10. As to claim 12, Gupta discloses a controller that is configured to route data objects to an associated transformer ( “application collaboration model” col. 4 lines 33-50).

11. As to claim 13, Gupta discloses routing a data object to the first transformer using a first controller (col. 5 lines 25-27).

12. As to claim 14, Gupta discloses routing the common format data object o the second transformer using a second controller (col. 5 lines 28-30).

13. As to claim 15, Gupta discloses at least one of the controllers comprises a class defined in an object-oriented programming language (col. 4 line 46).

14. As to claim 16, Gupta discloses an acknowledgement class to exchange status messages among applications (“saga” col. 8 lines 31-49).

15. As to claim 17, Gupta discloses using the acknowledgement class to perform exception handling (col. 9 line 58 – col. 10 line 8)

Art Unit: 2126

16. As to claims 18, 24, 38, 39 and 45, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 13 and 14 above.

17. As to claims 19 and 40, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 2 above.

18. As to claims 22 and 43, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 5 above.

19. As to claims 23 and 44, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

20. As to claims 27 and 48, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 10 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 3, 9, 20, 26, 28, 29, 31-37, 41 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (5,913,061).

23. As to claims 3, 9, 20, 26, 41 and 47, Gupta discloses using the first transformer to transform the data object from the format understandable by the first application into the

Art Unit: 2126

common format data object comprises translating the data object from a vendor-specific format associated with the first application to an interchange format object (col. 5 lines 22-24) and a shared object model (col. 6 lines 26-33).

24. Gupta does not disclose that this object is an Interface Data Language (IDL) object.

However IDL objects are well known in the art (CORBA objects).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use IDL objects as the interchange format object in the invention of Gupta as this would allow the use of existing IDL tools decreasing the cost of development.

26. As to claims 28, 29 and 33-36, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 3, 6 and 12 above.

27. As to claim 31, Gupta teaches the limitations as in claim 16 above.

28. As to claim 32, Gupta teaches the limitations as in claim 17 above.

29. As to claim 37, Gupta teaches the limitations as in claims 11 and 15 above.

30. Claims 4, 21 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (5,913,061) in view of Van Huben et al. (6,327,594).



Art Unit: 2126

31. As to claims 4, 21 and 42, Gupta discloses the data objects correspond to business events (col. 5 lines 10-17).

32. Gupta does not disclose the shared object model comprises a central repository.

33. Van Huben discloses a central repository of data objects (col. 20 lines 14-15).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the central repository of Van Huben in the invention of Gupta as having a single point of access would reduce the complexity and thus the cost of the system.

35. Claims 8, 25, 30 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (5,913,061) in view of De La Bourdonnaye (5,420,861).

36. As to claims 8, 25, 30 and 46, Gupta does not disclose publishing the common format data object to a communication channel is performed in accordance with a channel architecture that defines a plurality of communication channels having relative priorities.

37. De La Bourdonnaye discloses a channel architecture that defines a plurality of communication channels having relative priorities (abstract).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the channel architecture of De La Bourdonnaye in the invention of Gupta in order to ensure critical communications are not lost or slowed by non-critical communications.

Art Unit: 2126

39. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Bross whose telephone number is 703-305-8754. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EB

  
MENG-AI T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100